

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/503,362	02/14/2000	Pekka J. Heinonen	4925-34	6491
7590 11/04/2004		EXAMINER		
Michael C Stuart Esq Cohen Pontani Lieberman & Pavane 551 Fifth Avenue Suite 1210			SENFI, BEHROOZ M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
New York, NY	10176		2613	10
			DATE MAILED: 11/04/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
'		09/503,362	HEINONEN, PEKI	HEINONEN, PEKKA J.			
" (1) .	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	•	Behrooz Senfi	2613				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication r Reply	appears on the cover sheet	vith the correspondence ad	idress			
A SHO THE N - Exten after: - If the - If NO - Failur Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION is on time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by signly received by the Office later than three months after the model of the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NN. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of the riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC atute, cause the application to become	n reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timel INTHS from the mailing date of this control of the control of	y. ommunication.			
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on $\underline{0}$	4 August 2004.					
•	•	This action is non-final.					
3)	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the applicated Aa) Of the above claim(s) is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction are papers	drawn from consideration.					
	The specification is objected to by the Exan						
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
	The oath or declaration is objected to by the						
,							
_	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119	ing animika and 25 H C C	S 440(a) (d) a= (f)				
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docum 2. Certified copies of the priority docum 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docum application from the International Bu ee the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. Lents have been received in priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National	Stage			
Attachment							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date				
3) 🔲 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB No(s)/Mail Date		Informal Patent Application (PTC)-152)			

Art Unit: 2613

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see Brief, filed August 4, 2004, with respect to independent claims 1, 8, 14 and 15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1-2, 7-10 and 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Spaur et al (US 5,732,074).

Regarding claims 1 and 8, Spaur '074 discloses "a system for processing of data" (i.e. fig. 2) "to and from mobile terminal" (i.e. fig. 2, 80 – 84) comprising; "a data bus for receiving and transmitting data to a wireless communication network" (i.e. fig. 2, shows data buses for bi-directional wireless communication, air link), "an output device for presenting at least one of audio, video and texture information to a user" (i.e. fig. 2, 10(a)/60, which includes input and output devices with display screen), "an interface module connected to the data bus of the mobile terminal" (i.e. fig. 2, interface 30), "a protocol stack for processing data to and from the data bus of the mobile terminal" (i.e. fig. 2, TCP/IP stack 98, col. 3, lines 1 - 2), "the user agent for decoding data to and from

Art Unit: 2613

the protocol stack" (i.e. fig. 2, 50(a-n)), "a signal generator for converting the interpreted data from the user agent into signals formatted for processing by the output device so that the output device presents at least one of audio, video, and textual information to the user" (i.e. fig. 2, 10a/60, col. 9, lines 30 – 57).

Regarding claim 2, the claimed limitation "a user input device, manipulable by the user, for inputting data to the user agent for transmission through the mobile terminal" reads on (figs. 2, 10a/60, col. 7, lines 25 - 40).

Regarding claims 7, 9 - 10, the claimed limitation "the output device is a monitor" reads on (i.e. col. 7, lines 30 - 31, display screen), and "receiving user input data by the user agent for transmission by the mobile terminal, claim 10" reads on (fig. 2, 50, cols. 10, lines 1 - 21, wherein the device 50(a-n) interact with the network/internet for requesting/transmitting the data).

Regarding claims 14 - 15, the limitations claimed are substantially similar to claims 1 and 8, therefore the ground for rejecting claim 1 also applies here.

Furthermore, as for the additional limitation "mobile terminal comprising a screen" please see (i.e. fig. 1, display 16 of Braitberg et al (US 5,333,177) incorporated by the reference Spaur '074, col. 7, lines 65 - 66), and "interface module connected to the data bus of the mobile terminal and to the output device" reads on fig. 2, wherein the output device 10a/60 and the mobile terminal 80 - 84 and the interface 30 are being connected.

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 09/503,362

Art Unit: 2613

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 3 6, 11 13 and 16 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Spaur '074 as applied to claims 1 2 above, and further in view of Gershman et al. (US 6,401,085).

Regarding claims 3 and 11, the system of Spaur '074 (i.e. fig. 2) teaches, "bi-directional wireless communication for processing of data to and from mobile terminal" as discussed above, claim 1. Spaur '074 fails to explicitly teach "Wireless Application Protocol, WAP". However the above features are notoriously well-known and used in wireless/mobile communication systems/applications as evidenced by Gershman '085 (i.e. col. 2, lines 1 – 14). Therefore, taking the combined teaching of Spaur '074 and Gershman '085, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to include and use "WAP" protocol, as one of the alternative in wireless/mobile communication systems. Doing so would allow carriers to do more over the air management and give manufacturers a standard way to put data capability into wireless phones.

Regarding claims 4 and 12, combination of Spaur '074 and Gershman '085 teach, "protocol stack includes the Short Message Transport Protocol" reads on (i.e. fig. 2, TCP/IP stack 98 of Spaur '074, wherein by definition of computer dictionary "TCP/IP,

Art Unit: 2613

the protocol stack on the internet incorporates more than 100 standards including FTP, SMTP/short message transport protocol, etc.".

Regarding claims 5 and 13, combination of Spaur '074 and Gershman '085 teach, "the user agent is a web browser" (i.e. col. 12, lines 19 – 36 of Spaur).

Regarding claim 6, the claimed limitation "browser is configured to interpret data in accordance with one of the wireless Application Protocol and the Short Message Transport Protocol" are substantially similar in scope as recited in claims 3 and 4, therefore the grounds for rejecting claims 3 – 4, also apply here.

Regarding claim 16 – 19, combination of Spaur '074 and Gershman '085 teach, "television monitor" (i.e. fig. 17, television of Gershman).

6. Claim 1, 8 and 14 – 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rakib (US 2002/0019984).

The limitations as claimed in the independent claims 1, 8 and 14 – 15 reads on Rakib '984 reference, "a system for processing of data" (i.e. figs. 1 and 9), "to and from mobile terminal" (i.e. fig. 1, 30 PDA remote), comprising; "a data bus for receiving and transmitting data to a wireless communication network" (i.e. fig. 1), "an output device for presenting at least one of audio, video and texture information to a user" (i.e. figs. 1 and 3), "an interface module connected to the data bus of the mobile terminal" (i.e. fig. 3, gateway 102), "a protocol stack for processing data to and from the data bus of the mobile terminal" (i.e. fig. 3 and fig. 9, 418) furthermore it is well known that the gateway 102 in fig. 3, must include different protocols/multiple protocol in order to communicate with different devices. "a user agent for decoding data to and from the protocol stack"

Page 6

Application/Control Number: 09/503,362

Art Unit: 2613

(i.e. fig. 3, 110), "a signal generator for converting the interpreted data from the user agent into signals formatted for processing by the output device so that the output device presents at least one of audio, video, and textual information to the user" (fig. 3, 110).

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Behrooz Senfi** whose telephone number is (703)305-0132.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Chris Kelley** can be reached on **(703)305-4856.**

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relative to the status of the application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Art Unit: 2613

10/27/2004

CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

Page 7